



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,714	06/12/2001	Ross Halgren	45433/DBP/C664	5525
23363	7590	09/20/2005	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			LI, SHI K	
PO BOX 7068			ART UNIT	
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			PAPER NUMBER	
			2633	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

K

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/880,714	Applicant(s) HALGREN ET AL.	
	Examiner Shi K. Li	Art Unit 2633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7 June 2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites the limitation "with different data-rates received at respective ports" in lines 26-27 of the claim. The newly added limitation is not described in the specification as originally filed and is considered as new subject matter.

4. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

Art Unit: 2633

invention. Claim 17 recites the limitation "with different data-rates received at respective ports" in line 29 of the claim. The newly added limitation is not described in the specification as originally filed and is considered as new subject matter.

5. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 19 recites the limitation "with different data-rates received at respective ports" in lines 23-24 of the claim. The newly added limitation is not described in the specification as originally filed and is considered as new subject matter.

6. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 20 recites the limitation "with different data-rates received at respective ports" in lines 25 of the claim. The newly added limitation is not described in the specification as originally filed and is considered as new subject matter.

7. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 22 recites the limitation "with different data-rates received at respective ports" in lines 26-

Art Unit: 2633

27 of the claim. The newly added limitation is not described in the specification as originally filed and is considered as new subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bala et al. (U.S. Patent 6,335,992 B1) in view of Marmur (U.S. Patent 6,466,886 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 17 and 19, Bala et al. discloses in FIG. 1B an optical node for a WDM communication network. FIG. 1B comprises a first network interface unit 20 for demultiplexing an incoming WDM optical signal, a second network interface unit 40 for multiplexing channels into an outgoing WDM signal, a secondary interface unit 30 for dropping optical signal locally (see col. 5, lines 12-13) and a crossconnect 10. Bala et al. teaches in FIG. 5A a configuration for the crossconnect using electronic switch fabric. The difference between Bala et al. and the claimed invention is that Bala et al. does not teach that regeneration unit (receiver 140 and transmitter 150) utilizes at least 2R regeneration. Marmur teaches a 3R regeneration unit (see col. 1, line 54). Marmur teaches in FIG. 2 and col. 3, line 58-col. 4, line 34 to use a clock rate indication signal to control the CDR for handling different communication protocols. Marmur teaches in FIG. 2 a bypass path 22 for bypassing the CDR to form a 2R regenerator. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching

Art Unit: 2633

of Marmur with the optical node of Bala et al. because a 3R regeneration corrects timing in addition to power level and shape, and, therefore, provides high quality signal at the output interface unit. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use 3R regeneration, as taught by Marmur, in the optical node of Bala et al. because a 3R regeneration corrects timing in addition to power level and shape, and, therefore, provides high quality signal at the output interface unit.

Regarding claim 9, Marmur teaches the use of 3R regeneration.

Regarding claim 10, Marmur includes in FIG. 2 a programmable gate array 31 and in col. 3, line 58-col. 4, line 34 to send clock rate indication to CDR for different data-protocols. Therefore, Marmur teaches a programmable clock data recovery circuit.

Regarding claim 14, it is obvious that the switching unit can be incorporated in a circuit pack with either the first network interface unit or the second network interface unit.

Regarding claim 18, Bala et al. teaches in col. 4, lines 37-39 to incorporate the optical node in a network.

Regarding claim 22, Bale et al. teaches in FIG. 5A a configuration for the crossconnect using electronic switch fabric. The configuration of FIG. 5A is capable of switching an incoming optical channel of one wavelength to an outgoing optical channel of another wavelength. Therefore, the same signal is carried on different wavelength between different network nodes.

10. Claims 2-3 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bala et al. and Marmur as applied to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22 above, and further in view of Sahasrabuddhe et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2002/0159114 A1).

Art Unit: 2633

Bala et al. and Marmur have been discussed above in regard to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22. The difference between Bala et al. and Marmur and the claimed invention is that Bala et al. and Marmur do not teach an add-channel. Sahasrabuddhe et al. teaches in FIG. 3 to include an add-channel for adding local traffic to the network. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Sahasrabuddhe et al. with the modified optical node of Bala et al. and Marmur because network traffic are commonly bi-directional, e.g., Internet browsing and interactive transaction. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an add-channel in the modified optical node of Bala et al. and Marmur, as taught by Sahasrabuddhe et al., because network traffic are commonly bi-directional.

Regarding claim 3, Marmur suggests the use of 3R regeneration.

11. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bala et al. and Marmur as applied to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22 above, and further in view of Levine et al. (U.S. Patent 6,668,106 B1).

Bala et al. and Marmur have been discussed above in regard to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22. The difference between Bala et al. and Marmur and the claimed invention is that Bala et al. and Marmur do not teach a circuit card. Levine et al. teaches in FIG. 10 to arrange interfaces in interface cards. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Levine et al. with the modified optical node of Bala et al. and Marmur because arranging interface in circuit cards allows users to configure system according to capacity demand. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange the interfaces in circuit cards, as taught by Levine et al., in the

Art Unit: 2633

modified optical node of Bala et al. and Marmur because arranging interface in circuit cards allows users to configure system according to capacity demand.

12. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bala et al. and Marmur as applied to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22 above, and further in view of Grann (U.S. Patent 6,396,978 B1).

Bala et al. and Marmur have been discussed above in regard to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22. The difference between Bala et al. and Marmur and the claimed invention is that Bala et al. and Marmur do not teach a device for use both as a multiplexer and demultiplexer. Grann teaches in FIG. 1 a passive optical device that can be used as a multiplexer or a demultiplexer. The device can be applied for coarse WDM (see col. 2, lines 16-17). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Grann with the modified optical node of Bala et al. and Marmur because the multiplexer/demultiplexer of Grann is compact and cost effective and can reduce noise (for example, see col. 2, lines 38-45). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the multiplexer/demultiplexer of Grann in the modified optical node of Bala et al. and Marmur because the multiplexer/demultiplexer of Grann is compact and cost effective and can reduce noise.

13. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bala et al. and Marmur as applied to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22 above, and further in view of Zadikian et al. (U.S. Patent 6,631,134 B1).

Bala et al. and Marmur have been discussed above in regard to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22. The difference between Bala et al. and Marmur and the claimed invention is that Bala et

Art Unit: 2633

al. and Marmur do not teach redundant switching unit. Zadikian et al. teaches in FIG. 3 redundant architecture to increase system reliability for failure protection. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Zadikian et al. with the modified optical node of Bala et al. and Marmur because redundant architecture increases system reliability and protects against failure. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include redundant switching unit, as taught by Zadikian et al., in the modified optical node of Bala et al. and Marmur because redundant architecture increases system reliability and protects against failure.

14. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bala et al. and Marmur as applied to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22 above, and further in view of Gersbach et al. (U.S. Patent 5,371,766).

Bala et al. and Marmur have been discussed above in regard to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22. The difference between Bala et al. and Marmur and the claimed invention is that Bala et al. and Marmur do not teach to implement the regeneration unit as a very large scale integration (VLSI) structure. Gersbach et al. teaches in col. 4, lines 31-38 that regeneration circuit is well suitable for VLSI implementation. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Gersbach et al. with the modified optical node of Bala et al. and Marmur because VLSI implementation reduces size and increases reliability. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the regeneration unit with VLSI structure, as taught by Gersbach et al., in the modified optical node of Bala et al. and Marmur because VLSI implementation reduces size and increases reliability.

Art Unit: 2633

15. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bala et al., Marmur and Grann as applied to claims 11-13 above, and further in view of Sahasrabuddhe et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2002/0159114 A1).

Bala et al., Marmur and Grann have been discussed above in regard to claims 11-13. The difference between Bala et al., Marmur and Grann and the claimed invention is that Bala et al., Marmur and Grann do not teach an add-channel. Sahasrabuddhe et al. teaches in FIG. 3 to include an add-channel for adding local traffic to the network. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Sahasrabuddhe et al. with the modified optical node of Bala et al., Marmur and Grann because network traffic are commonly bi-directional, e.g., Internet browsing and interactive transaction. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an add-channel in the modified optical node of Bala et al., Marmur and Grann, as taught by Sahasrabuddhe et al., because network traffic are commonly bi-directional.

16. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bala et al. and Marmur as applied to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22 above, and further in view of Okano et al. (U.S. Patent 6,449,074 B1).

Bala et al. and Marmur have been discussed above in regard to claims 1, 9-10, 14, 17-19 and 22. The difference between Bala et al. and Marmur and the claimed invention is that Bala et al. and Marmur do not teach that the dropped optical signal has a wavelength different from the corresponding optical channel signal received at the network interface. However, it is well known in the art that local facilities use wavelength different from long-haul transmission facilities. For example, Okano et al. teaches in FIG. 1 and col. 4, lines 26-37 to include

Art Unit: 2633

wavelength converters 24 in transponder 18 for converting wavelengths used for WDM transmission to wavelengths suitable for local optical receiver 20. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Okano et al. with the modified WDM communication network of Bala et al. and Marmur because local facilities use different wavelengths from long-haul WDM transmission facilities. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use transponder as wavelength converter for converting wavelength used for long-haul WDM transmission to wavelength for local facilities, as taught by Okano et al., in the modified WDM communication network of Bala et al. and Marmur.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments filed on 7 June 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that none of the prior art documents cited, either taken alone or in combination, teach or make obvious a network node as claimed in amended claim 1. The Examiner disagrees. Regarding the newly added limitation regarding "bypassing connection", Marmur teaches in FIG. 2 and col. 3, lines 14-19 bypass path 22. The newly added limitation regarding "different data-rates" is new matter. Therefore, the Applicant's argument is moot. Furthermore, Marmur teaches in FIG. 4 different protocols with different data-rates. Therefore, the combination of Bala et al. and Marmur teaches each and every limitations of claim 1.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2633

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shi K. Li whose telephone number is 571 272-3031. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on 571 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

skl

13 September 2005



Shi K. Li
Patent Examiner